HUMAN EVENTS

ol. XV, No. 8 Monday, February 24, 1958 Washington, D. C.

'ews Section *Printed in Two Sections*

KE: *Concern over his health* (page 1)

EXAS IKEMEN: *Unnatural gas pains* (page 2)

JMMIT: *Grass-roots opposition grows* (page 2)

READLINES: *'Liberal' specter* (page 3)

3C: *Left-wing scandals* (page 3)

he Renunciation Magnificent: In Washington clubs id restaurants, in congressional cloakrooms — wherever portant figures gather — one topic has been receiving e kind of frank discussion and exploration which, for vious reasons, cannot prevail in the press and on the air.

That burning subject is the situation arising from the esident's health and what to do about it. In the past ek, one remark recurred — the President once again *had* go to Georgia for a rest. For clearly, with the recession epening, the President would not leave his key spot in e Capital merely to disport himself; he is much too nscientious an Executive.

These vacations, observers infer, underline what has en felt rather than uttered publicly — that President senhower unfortunately is in such frail health that he nnot give the time and energy necessary to his vital sition, at this juncture of foreign and domestic crisis.

"Domestic" — that factor commands urgent attention day. For even warm admirers of Eisenhower had to flect on an ominous sequence which occurred week before st. In his public televised statement, February 12, the esident expressed an optimistic expectation of improved siness conditions. Yet shares on the New York Stock change immediately declined — for the sixth successive y — and leaned downward again the following day. ie opinion of the market, say political analysts, cannot minimized. The sequence recalls certain unhappy events the 1929-33 depression. Few here deny that the Presi- nt — however likeable he remains among the mass of e people — has lost the gift of inspiring the confidence essential to reviving business sentiment.

Considerations of this sort lie behind the growing de- nd for legislation to replace an ailing Chief Executive, least on a temporary basis. Concurrently, some legis- ors contemplate a personal approach to persuade the esident that his retirement would prove an historically urageous act.

As one observer put it: "Ike would win for himself an extraordinary niche in history, if he became the first President to retire voluntarily. Roosevelt failed to do so — should indeed have done so — as he was obviously a dying man in the last six months of his life. Many admirers of Woodrow Wilson deplore his retaining office during the severe illness of the last year of his second term, and believe that one unpleasant page of history could have been avoided if he had stepped down.

"Real grace and high patriotism would be demonstrated if Ike would realize that the time to retire had been reached. If he should wait until he becomes totally incapacitated, he might lack the coherence of thought and feeling to take the initiative in such an unprecedented way. If he were forced to retire under the terms of new legislation, his exit from the White House — while it would undoubtedly be regarded with deep sympathy — would be less glorious than if the determination to vacate the Presidential chair were a matter of his personal choice."

If Eisenhower should take the decisive step of abnegation, Vice President Nixon (after all the well-known training and briefing that he has had in the past two years) would assume the Presidential role with a welcome vigor — in view of his comparative youth. So runs predominant Capital opinion.

Veteran observers in Washington, who have watched many changes in the Presidential office, are convinced that a "honeymoon" of the most beneficial character would follow replacement of Ike by Nixon. The Democrats on Capitol Hill — and especially the "liberals" — could hardly withhold their warm cooperation with the new President for many months. Some of these recall with shame the contrary course pursued by their party leaders in the period 1929-33 — when their harrying tactics served to aggravate the serious business situation.

HUMAN EVENTS *has sounded out many leaders of the Republican party who believe that retirement of Ike would have a favorable effect on GOP chances in the elections of next November. But, they also add, "it ought to be done no matter what partisan consequences might follow." Finally, leaders of business are convinced that such a change would impart a new sense of confidence to the whole business community.*

Labor Front: Friends of former Governor George N. Craig of Indiana claim that he stands ready to testify before the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee when that body goes into the question of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers union. In 1955, the UAW, in order to force compulsory unionism on the workers of the Perfect Circle Piston Ring Company of New Castle, Indiana, engaged in a wild orgy of intimidation and violence. Those who know Craig relate that when the Indiana Governor sent militia

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the plants of that company to restore order, Reuther phoned him to ask that the militia be called off. Craig — according to his friends — replied that he could not comply unless Reuther pledged himself to stop further violence by UAW elements. Reuther promised to do so, but the violence continued.

Craig's militia put down the rioting and the subsequent return of workers to the Perfect Circle plants brought the strike to an end. The National Labor Relations Board then held an election among the company's workers, who voted down the compulsory unionism that the UAW had demanded.

Off-Beat In Politics: The real low-down on the fantastic Houston, Texas, dinner for GOP leader Joe Martin, and the gas-oil money raised there, is passed to HUMAN EVENTS by well-informed Texas sources. The funds raised — running to about $100,000 — did not go to the Republican Senatorial and Congressional campaign committees, as is commonly believed; nor, of course, did they go to the GOP National Committee, after the White House rejected the money as "tainted."

The story is that the money was used to retire the obligations of Ike's Texas supporters, largely incurred by the "Citizens for Eisenhower" and "Democrats for Eisenhower" groups, during the Presidential campaign of 1956. No protests have been heard from the national "Citizens for Ike" organization, or from the White House.

● TV station operators, when talking off the record, say the really important scandal about the Federal Communications Commission receives no front-page publicity at all. It is this: licenses to own TV stations are often worth from $100,000 to several million dollars. The FCC, however, makes absolute *gifts* of these licenses; the law provides that the Commission shall choose the applicant who is "most qualified." Actually — say these voices in the trade — the FCC should be required to grant the franchise to the highest qualified bidder (which is normal procedure in letting Government contracts).

The blame for the present situation, continue the critics, rests on Congress. Too many members like the current system because it enables them to wield their influence in behalf of important constituents or campaign contributors. The law, conclude these analysts, ought to be changed, and licenses should be "auctioned off" to the highest responsible and qualified bidder.

Along Diplomatic Row: On Massachusetts Avenue, where red carpets reign, the chanceries have been busy analyzing the President's reply to Bulganin. Contrary to the wire service reports, foreign diplomats interpret Ike's answer, not as a "strong" and "discouraging" response, but as an "appeasing" communication concealed under a superficially brusque tone. One observer remarked: "He must have a new ghost writer."

Far from repulsing Muscovite maneuvers to obtain Summit meeting, the note—say these striped-pants analyst — actually leaves the door wide open for a visit b Bulganin or Khrushchev to Washington. What other in terpretation, it is asked, can be put on the President' suggestion for a meeting of minds with Soviet "leade of thought"?

Meanwhile, closer examination of recent events r volving around the touchy subject of a high-level parle brings out various disturbing signs and portents. Protoco people remark that the new Soviet Ambassador Menshiko was accorded a most unusual welcome. Scarcely had h landed in Washington than he was enabled to go to th White House to see the President. According to accepte protocol, the incoming Ambassador first visits the Stat Department and pays a call on the Secretary of Stat Then, a few days later, he gets to the White House. Th alteration of this long-sanctioned procedure has give foreign missions here the feeling that the White House moving strenuously to bring about a Summit meeting.

Menshikov, who speaks English, is a superficially a tractive personality — a fact which has inspired addition suspicions here concerning Soviet intentions. The selectio of this kind of Ambassador — in contrast to his rath forbidding predecessors in the Embassy — has given man the feeling that Khrushchev's "advance man" is assigne to "charm" high American officials into assenting to th controversial parley.

After Menshikov called on Nixon, the Vice Presider was heard to remark acidly: "What does that fellow wa with me?"

It is also noted that Menshikov was not accompanie by an interpreter. True, he speaks and understands Englis well. Some of his predecessors (*e.g.*, Troyanovsky an Oumansky), however, handled the language even mo expertly and they were always accompanied by an i terpreter. The interpreter, it was believed, was actuall a GPU agent, assigned by the distrustful Kremlin to s that the Soviet Ambassador conducted his conversation strictly according to Moscow's orders. Obviously, conclu analysts of Soviet tactics, Menshikov is Khrushchev trusted personal emissary.

Many on Capitol Hill are profoundly disturbed by a this. One important GOP Senator, just emerged from th Senators' private dining room in the Capitol, remark to a member of the staff of HUMAN EVENTS:

"We all think that Menshikov was thoroughly briefe by Burgess and Maclean [the two turncoat British dipl mats who have been living and working behind the Ir Curtain for the past seven years]. Those two fellows, fro their own experience here years ago, probably told hi just how to flatter and cozen innocent American officials

● Word from the constituencies, however, suggests th sentiment is rising against attempts to accommodate t Soviet desire for a Summit meeting. The Omaha *Worl Herald*, which blankets Nebraska and parts of surroundi states, editorially made the point, on February 17, th

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

onstitutionally, the President cannot commit the United States through agreements at a Summit meeting without aking up the matter with Congress. Pointing to the evil consequences of Yalta, Potsdam and Geneva, the editorial ays that "we Americans had better steer clear of any uture entanglements of the same sort." And the Omaha aper asks readers to write their Senators and Congressnen, urging opposition to a Summit conference (see "FDR t the 'Summit'" item, below).

● Additionally noted as a sign of the firm opposition f the American people to any and all forms of appeasenent of international communism was this news from ennsylvania: Philadelphia's Mayor, Richardson Dilworth, who wanted to receive the Democratic gubernatorial nomiation, was turned down by the state Democratic organiation.

The reason given by the Democratic bosses: that Dilworth (a prominent ADAer) had recently urged US recognition of Red China. While this may not have been the real reason for their rejection of Dilworth, it is significant of the unpopularity of such gestures of appeasement that the bosses should choose this pretext for voicing their opposition.

loom and Doom: Tennessee's "liberal" Democratic enator Albert Gore kicked up a dust cloud of indignation arly this month when he decried a so-called "breadline" n Memphis, declaring: "I am surprised and disturbed to nd approximately ten per cent of the people of Shelby ounty [Memphis] standing in lines for distress distribuion of food."

Shortly thereafter, Senator Thomas Martin (R.-Iowa) ttacked Gore's Memphis story — along with a similar ne from Chattanooga's Democratic Mayor P. R. Olgiati — pointing out that it had been assailed by Tennessee ources, and even by members of Gore's own party.

(Memphis officials said 10,352 families there had regisered for aid, but that many of them were farm laborers rom east Arkansas, north Mississippi and west Tennessee, n search of off-season jobs.)

One Tennessee Democrat challenging Gore was Conressman Clifford Davis, who represents Memphis (Tenessee's Ninth District). Commented Davis: "I am greatly isturbed that Senator Gore was quoted up here that ten er cent of our population was on relief. That would be oughly 60,000 people. We had a disastrous crop season. verybody knows we had too much rain. To say that we re in that bad shape is not understandable to me."

(Whereas Gore's estimate would place Memphis' unmployed at 60,000, the Tennessee State Department of abor places the figure at about 17,000 — or less than ne-third of Gore's estimate.)

A multimillion-dollar sector of the Memphis economy, Davis told HUMAN EVENTS, would be hurt unless Gore's 'sounding off" was corrected.

Iowa's Martin summed up the indictment: "The Demorats who inspire those 'breadline' stories or who issue gloomy and distorted pronouncements on the Nation's economic situation must certainly be aware of the grave harm their irresponsible actions can do to public confidence and to business activity itself."

Foreign Aid: News dispatches from Poland, February 9, reveal that the Communist regime there was taking steps to insure loyalty to itself and to the Soviet Union. The Polish press, it was revealed, may not print anything which might be construed as critical of Marxism or of the Kremlin. "Baiting of the Soviet Union" — even in indirect form—has been made a specific cause for official reprisal.

Yet one week after these reports of continued despotism and loyalty to Moscow on the part of the Warsaw regime, US officials extended to the Red Government of Poland a credit agreement totalling $98 million.

Snow Story: The furious snow storm that lashed the East Coast last week, piling Washington's streets with 14 inches of snow, brought vindication of those who have long charged that the Federal bureaucracy is hopelessly swollen with unnecessary personnel. In deference to the city's hampered transportation facilities, the White House decreed last Sunday that only "absolutely essential" bureaucrats needed to show up next day for their jobs.

Result: a mere 47,000 out of 235,000 Federal employees came to work on Monday — suggesting that 80 per cent of the bureaucracy does not feel that its presence is "essential" to the functioning of the Government. "The Weather Bureau," commented one pundit, "is taking up where the Hoover Commission left off."

'Liberal' Scandals: Washingtonians continue to take the wrath of "liberal" Democrats against alleged "fixers" in and around US regulatory agencies with the proverbial grain of salt (see HUMAN EVENTS for February 17, 1958). Conservatives have no brief for anyone wielding undue influence in the jungle of "administrative law," but they raise the question: why is it that the "liberals" show such indignation over the peccadilloes of elements in the business community, but have little or nothing to say about the similar, or worse, misdemeanors of fellow members of the left wing?

Cited in this connection are scandals in India involving a high official of the Nehru Government, Finance Minister T. T. Krishnamachari (this was the official who journeyed to America last September to negotiate India's most recent loan from the US, totalling $225 million). Krishnamachari, whom Nehru had to discharge from his post, was implicated in the purchase of $3 million worth of stock, with Government-controlled funds, to help an Indian speculator out of financial difficulties. This scandal, tarring India's Marxist regime, has aroused no outraged commentary from America's "liberals" — who normally show benevolent interest in the life and times of the Nehru Government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Closer to home, conservatives note the action earlier this month of Federal Judge John W. Murphy, who ordered Representative William J. Green, Jr. (D.-Pa.) to stand trial on charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government in a deal involving a $33 million Federal installation. (Green, a straight ADA-voting Congressman, is chairman of the Democratic organization in Philadelphia.)

The indictment against Green and his fellow defendants, related the Philadelphia *Inquirer*, "charged Green with improper influence, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee in Congress, in obtaining contracts for some of those named with him, as well as using his office to obtain business for his private insurance firm."

"Innocent until proved guilty," conservatives note, is equally true of Green and of the alleged "fixers" brought before the House Subcommittee investigating the regulatory agencies. Why then, it is asked, the "liberal" silence in one case, and the "liberal" indignation in the other?

FDR at the 'Summit': As the propaganda barrage for a new Summit conference increases in intensity, Washingtonians note that this week will mark the thirteenth anniversary of President Roosevelt's return from the fateful "Summit" meeting with Stalin at Yalta. (It was on March 1, 1945, that Roosevelt addressed Congress on the outcome of the conference.) This week, HUMAN EVENTS publishes for the first time extracts from an important document shedding additional light on what was perhaps the most disastrous such meeting in history.

Unearthed by informed World War II researchers, this document, a day-by-day, hour-by-hour log compiled by a member of the President's party, deals with three problems currently in the news: international exchanges of gifts, security measures and the work of the US intelligence service. The Yalta log discloses that lavish gifts (airplanes complete with crews, luxury automobiles, *etc.)* were presented to Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, King Farouk of Egypt and King Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia. The report does not say who paid for these offerings.

Also noted in the report are glaring indications of laxness in security procedures during the conference — a laxness which, the mounting historical evidence indicates, characterized most of the New Deal's dealings with the Soviet Union. Anti-Communists are aghast at the thought of the 80-mile communications line which ran through Soviet territory from the conference site to the President's ship. No wonder, it is observed, that the log states: "For the first few days we experienced 'wire trouble' between Livadia and Sevastopol."

And the question is raised: why did it take four days for mail to be delivered to Roosevelt and his advisers at Yalta? The report makes no gesture at answering such questions, or those arising from the "intelligence reports" that the President relied upon in bargaining with Stalin.

One appalling example of the latter, included in the document, blamed Chiang Kai-shek for Communist-caused friction in China, citing his alleged failure "to trust and work in harmony with the so-called Communist troops in the North." (That the Chinese Red were only "so-called" Communists — or "agrarian reformers" — was a principal feature of the Communist line at that time.) Who, it is asked, was the source of the information contained in this briefing?

Comment the analysts who pass this information to HUMAN EVENTS: another page in the voluminous book of evidence against top-level conferences with the Communists. (For further comment on Yalta and its bearing on Summit conference demands today, see "Suicide at the Summit," by Sisley Huddleston, in Article Section of this issue.)

Between Covers: *How the NLRB Repealed Taft-Hartley* by Sylvester Petro; Labor Policy Association, Inc. 1624 Eye St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. $2.

This book, subtitled "The Destruction of Free Employee Choice," is a thorough and devastating critique of the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, licensing coercive activities of labor unions. By close inspection of the Congressional debates attending the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, Dr. Petro shows that the legislators' intent was to preserve the ability of employees to belong or not to belong to unions, uncoerced by either management or union officials. But the NLRB — as this analysis shows in detail — by a long series of distorted interpretations and violations or legal practice, has managed to defeat the intent of Congress, allowing the very activities (chiefly coercive organizational picketing by persons not working at the firm picketed) that Taft-Hartley was designed to prevent. This study, exhaustively documented and carefully reasoned, should prove to be a basic text in future discussions of labor law.

THOMAS E. COLEMAN, Former Republican National Vice Chairman: "I have the greatest admiration for HUMAN EVENTS. You publish an excellent letter based on good American principles."

J. ORRIN GOULD, Major, Chaplain, US Army, Ret.: "I appreciate HUMAN EVENTS more than I can tell you. I refer to HUMAN EVENTS in my calls and from the pulpit continually. It is an inspiration passed on to others every week."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots of $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO), $14 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.
Bound Annual Volume for 1957, with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 8 HUMAN EVENTS February 24, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

A campaign is now under way to persuade US officials to consent to a high-level, face-to-face conference between the leaders of America and the Soviet Union. Unless action is taken immediately by responsible Americans, such a "Summit conference" may take place. In the article that follows, Sisley Huddleston — whose reputation as an analyst of the diplomatic scene is unequalled — dissects the fallacious belief that "personal diplomacy" can achieve good results. He shows what disaster has followed such efforts in the past, and points out the reasons why it always will.

Additionally, HUMAN EVENTS has compiled an appendix to Huddleston's analysis (see page 4), showing why such attempts to deal with the Soviet Union are especially futile. This appendix presents the Soviet record — the most shameful in the entire history of diplomacy — of smashed and disregarded agreements.

You can act *now* to head off another Summit conference. Send copies of this article to your two Senators, and tell them to work for passage of a "sense of the Senate" resolution opposing a Summit conference. Tell your Congressman, too, to put himself on record against any such high-level meeting.

SUICIDE AT THE SUMMIT
Why Top-Level Conferences are Always Disastrous

By SISLEY HUDDLESTON

IT WAS President Wilson who began the fatal practice of "top-level" conferences in diplomacy, when he came over to Europe to take a personal part in the peace-making at Paris. He set a precedent that has been followed with increasingly dire effects on peace and human happiness. Thenceforth, Presidents, Prime Ministers, Secretaries of State, and Foreign Ministers thought it their business to enter into personal negotiations, make personal decisions, be guided by personal considerations — sometimes electoral, sometimes purely temperamental — in matters that far transcended their persons, in matters that should be approached in the most impersonal manner possible.

In foreign affairs, a high functionary of the state entrusted with the most vital responsibilities should forget that he is Wilson or Roosevelt or Truman or Acheson, or Dulles or Churchill or Eden; he should remember only that he is a lofty and lonely figure, a final court of appeal placed by his office above the dusty arena of personal contacts, personal prejudices, personal sentiments of any kind.

The recent doctrine and practice of cultivating warm likes, and therefore extreme dislikes, for the representatives of other countries is palpably wrong. Let a President or Prime Minister fondle his children and grandchildren, let him cherish his wife, let him surround himself with personal friends — on condition that wife, children and friends refrain from influencing him in public concerns.

The old kings had their favorites, both men and women, but the best of them understood that these favorites belonged to an intimate circle from which affairs of state should be rigorously excluded. Moreover, when the kings of old received the emissaries of foreign countries, it was strictly in their regal role, and the ambassadors remained in their ambassadorial role — that is to say, impersonal. There was no backslapping, vodka-drinking, toasts, no de-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sire to charm, and no desire to be charmed; the issues at stake had nothing to do with the personal feelings of "Frankie" for "Joe" or "Joe" for "Frankie." All this affectation of Christian names, of pet names, is part of the new popular diplomacy, and as such is abhorrent to sound diplomacy. Leave the business of pokes in the stomach to the local politicans, and embraces to the cinema stars and pin-up girls.

THE HABIT of top-level meetings has brought untold harm to the world. It began at Versailles, and has continued in a countless series of top-level conferences, in which "top levels" entertained each other in the most diverse surroundings, made themselves "feel good," and wrested mutual concessions from each other. Probably never before in world history was as much damage done to international well-being, peace and decency as at the wartime top-level conferences, running through Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, Quebec, Yalta and Potsdam.

The top-level leaders had plenty of trained official agents. What were those agents for, if not to transmit to their chiefs, who should carefully study the facts in the quiet of their official studies, thinking only of their nation's present and future welfare, without paying the slightest heed either to the clamors of the crowd or to the "charm" of host or hostess?

The personal equation in diplomacy — at least on top-levels — can bring only false judgments founded on the mood of the moment, the sort of dinner that has been eaten, the number of glasses drunk, the spirit of comradeship aroused. In an atmosphere of momentary geniality, contentment, or alcoholic exaltation, the highest personages, with the most overwhelming responsibilities, are inclined to yield on points that are of the utmost weight, as they would never do in the calm deliberation of their study.

It is now generally conceded that the decision taken at Casablanca at the beginning of 1943, for example, was highly regrettable, since it needlessly prolonged the war for more than a year, and brought complete chaos to Europe. That decision, it will be remembered, was to insist on "unconditional surrender." After Casablanca, in spite of the growing antagonism to Hitler in the German army, the generals and the German people were informed that there was no hope for them. They could do nothing but fight while any fight was left in them.

(Wilson had been wiser for, at the time of framing the Fourteen Points, he had not stirred from the White House. The trouble was that he afterwards betrayed most of them through his disastrous personal contacts with European statesmen as a result of his combination of a top-level diplomatic conference with a belated honeymoon.)

We are told that the "unconditional surrender" idea came to Roosevelt in a sudden flash, that he remembered that General Grant (who, nevertheless, treated his vanquished foe, General Lee, with fine soldierly respect) had pronounced the words "unconditional surrender." Without more thought, he threw out the suggestion, and we are told that Churchill reluctantly adopted it. No doubt it suited the temper of the Allied peoples at the moment; no doubt it was popular diplomacy; but it had fatal results for us all.*

By leading to the total destruction of Germany and the enthronement of Soviet Russia as the dominant power in the Old World, the Casablanca Summit conference can very accurately be regarded as one of the most disastrous turning points in world history.

Later, at Teheran, Russia, the United States and Britain, represented by their top levels, took decisions amid Levantine festivities that sealed the fate of Europe, of the East, perhaps of America. The reactionary doctrine of "spheres of influence" — in other words the domination of Great Powers over weaker powers — was revived, to the advantage of Stalin. It was a joyous occasion, but it was the parent of endless misery, confusion, and difficulties, from which

* Roosevelt was even sloppy on his history: it was at Fort Donelson in 1862, not at Appomattox in 1865, that General Grant had demanded "unconditional surrender."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we now suffer and are likely to suffer for generations.

Does anyone imagine that Churchill or Roosevelt would have given so much away — in contradiction to the Atlantic Charter — had the proposals been submitted to them in the privacy of their closets? Yet at Yalta and Potsdam, the conquests of Stalin were confirmed and augmented.

Thus the Slavilization of much of Europe and a considerable part of Asia was due to the impulsiveness of statesmen who did not understand that, whenever grave decisions are to be made, no one, however able he may think himself to be, and however able he may actually be in his sober moments, has a right to act according to his temporary personal feelings, or the momentary feelings of the public. He must not be hasty in his judgments; he must make them, so far as possible, in seclusion, after careful consideration of the immediate and subsequent consequences. He must listen to all, but he must not be unduly influenced by any.*

IT IS NOT my purpose to criticize Roosevelt; he was a sick man in the later stages of the war; but it is incumbent on me to condemn the method of personal contacts at top levels. It was there that the mischief was done. That Uncle Joe appeared to be an amiable and decent sort of chap in these meetings was not a sufficient reason for taking an immense gamble with human lives and the very destiny of the human race. To imagine that an appeal to Stalin's moral sense would alter the fate of Poland or the Baltic States was disastrous folly. Indeed, from the Russian viewpoint, Stalin would have been blameworthy had he surrendered to any such personal persuasion. He was well within his role in obtaining all he could, and of sticking to what was given to him. He would have been a poor leader had he relinquished an inch of territory offered to him or won by him, except on grounds of national prudence. He, at least, was not susceptible to flattery or to mere sentiment. And to talk about his moral sense is not merely absurd, it ignores and obscures the immorality of his interlocutors in bartering away the liberties of innocent and helpless peoples.

Had America stood up to Russia at Teheran and Yalta, she would have saved herself billions of dollars, and she would have spared Europe the horrors of enslavement. For, if Stalin was not amenable to flattery or to sentiment, he would have been amenable to force and firmness in 1945. I certainly have no excessive sympathy for Germany, but the most elementary knowledge of Europe — or even of physics — would have indicated that you cannot create a void in the heart of Europe without inviting another power — in this case Russia — to fill the vacuum. And what a void is a defeated and unarmed Germany in Europe! What a void are the Balkans, emptied of their German occupants! These voids it was our duty to fill before others could do so. To grant in principle to Russia at Teheran a zone of influence without effective guarantees, to consent to the new partition of Poland and of Germany, to permit the deportation of 10 to 15 million Germans from lands their ancestors had occupied for centuries, was to stultify the Atlantic Charter which proclaimed that there should be no change of territory, no exchange of peoples, without their formal consent.

To concur at Yalta, on the last-minute promise of Russia to help America against Japan (help even then known to be quite unnecessary), in the Russian occupation of the Kuriles, of Sakhalin, and in the Russian domination of Port Arthur, of Dairen, of Manchuria, of part of Korea, was to ignore the possibilities of later Russian expansion throughout the whole of Asia, and the tragic possibilities of the bloody fighting which has already come in Korea. The effects of these wartime top-level conferences were fully as disastrous as those of that first ominous top-level conference at Paris in 1919.

* It would seem that Churchill was not wholly blind to the possible results of hysterical popular policy, but he was overawed or overruled. Churchill was something less than enthusiastic over the "unconditional surrender" plank at Casablanca, and was outraged by Stalin's suggestion at Teheran that 50,000 generals and technicians be murdered after hostilities. But he gave way on both of these disastrous proposals. "He thinks too much of the postwar situation," Roosevelt is reported to have said of Churchill. "He fears that Russia will become too strong. Would a strong Russia be a bad thing? Anyhow, Stalin merely wants security for Russia."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRESIDENT TRUMAN, after his unfortunate lapse at Potsdam, when he was new to office, rightly declined to lend his countenance to top-level talks. One would have thought that every sensible man would have looked askance on a system that has been so tragically discredited in our time, but it would seem that Churchill has continued to hanker after top-level talks. So, seemingly, have Stalin and his successors. In the light of his vast gains from the top-level talks of wartime, one could hardly blame Stalin for wishing to perpetuate them. Surely, the only safe guide for the head of a state is to demand that any propositions shall be put in writing, examined impartially by experts, and submitted to him without the pernicious and debilitating influence of personal contacts. He must beware of his own weaknesses, his spells of weariness and inattention, and the "charm" of those whose natural and legitimate design is to betray him into errors and concessions that cannot be undone.

This article is condensed from the book, *Popular Diplomacy and War,* by the late Sisley Huddleston. The book, copyright by Richard R. Smith Publishers, is distributed by the Devin-Adair Company, 23 East 26th St., New York 10, N. Y. Price: $3.50. The table appearing in the adjoining column, as an appendix to the article, is compiled from facts contained in the staff study of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "Soviet Political Agreements and Results."

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "SUICIDE AT THE SUMMIT" at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

THIS IS THE RECORD

(The following list represents *only a portion* of the diplomatic agreements reached, and whose terms were violated, by the Communist Government of the USSR.*)

Soviet Agreement	*Date*	*Result*
To recognize independence of Finland	Dec. 31, 1917	VIOLATED
To renounce sovereignty over Lithuania and Latvia	Aug. 27, 1918	VIOLATED
To recognize self-determination of Ukraine	Dec. 28, 1920	VIOLATED
To prohibit Bolshevik propaganda in Great Britain	Mar. 16, 1921	VIOLATED
To end hostilities with Poland	Mar. 18, 1921	VIOLATED
To conclude a friendship agreement with Czechoslovakia	June 5, 1922	VIOLATED
To renounce all privileges, concessions and rights of extra-territoriality in China	May 31, 1924	VIOLATED
To refrain from any propaganda, subversion or espionage in US	Nov. 16, 1933	VIOLATED
To guarantee Rumanian sovereignty	June 9, 1934	VIOLATED
To obey principles of the League of Nations	Sept. 15, 1934	VIOLATED
To pledge adherence to tenets of the Atlantic Charter	Sept. 24, 1941	VIOLATED
To honor principles of the UN Declaration	Jan. 1, 1942	VIOLATED
To remove all military forces from Iran within 6 months after end of World War II	Jan. 29, 1942	VIOLATED
To return to US all undestroyed lend-lease weapons	June 11, 1942	VIOLATED
To establish a free and independent Austria	Oct. 19, 1943	VIOLATED
To create a democratic and unified Korea	Nov. 22, 1943	VIOLATED
To honor democratic processes in China and Eastern Europe (Yalta Conference)	Feb. 4, 1943	VIOLATED
To limit the "police force" of East Germany in size and weapons	June 5, 1945	VIOLATED
To abide by UN Charter	June 26, 1945	VIOLATED
To unify Germany and to provide for democratic procedures in Eastern Europe (Potsdam Conference)	July 17, 1945	VIOLATED
To support Nationalist China	Dec. 16, 1945	VIOLATED
To return all German prisoners-of-war within two years	Mar. 10, 1947	VIOLATED
To end Berlin Blockade	May 4, 1949	VIOLATED
To establish armistice in Korea	July 27, 1953	VIOLATED
To restore peace in Indo-China and to prohibit troop build up	July 21, 1954	VIOLATED
To discuss German reunification at the Geneva Conference	July 17, 1955	VIOLATED

**Source: Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED